

world. In Serbia and Bosnia, soldiers, POWs, and civilians were beheaded by mujahideen. In Beslan, Russia, 186 children and 158 teachers and parents were slaughtered in a terrorist assault against a grade school. And just weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, in Indonesia, three young girls on their way to school were attacked and beheaded by Muslim extremists. Their names, Mr. Speaker, their names were Theresa, Ida, and Alfrita.

Churches are being attacked. Pastors have been kidnapped, tortured, and beheaded. And it seems there is not a day that goes by without a suicide or a car bomb attack in Iraq.

We have witnessed the horrific bombings in Spain, London, Indonesia, Jordan, and Israel. Rioters have completely disrupted hundreds of cities in France.

We simply cannot deny that we are fighting a war against enemies with an evil ideology that is bent on the destruction of the Western World. They are committed to killing us, Mr. Speaker, and any others that hold in their mind to be infidels.

Mr. Speaker, we truly are at war, and to undermine the sacrifice and blood-bought advancement of our valiant American soldiers who are at this very moment fighting terrorists in Iraq and across the world is unconscionable.

A nation divided against itself simply cannot stand, Mr. Speaker. And those of us in this body, along with all Americans, must unite against this evil. We must win the war in Iraq. We must give our troops unequivocal support and everything else in our power to help them finish this job. Our troops have never failed us, and we must not fail them.

Mr. Speaker, if freedom is to survive, to allow Islamist terrorists to declare war and victory in Iraq is not an option. We must win and we cannot leave before the job is done. Because if we leave too soon, Mr. Speaker, we will not be able to go on with our daily lives as we once did. Because the world has truly changed. And those without conscience are relentlessly seeking to destroy us, and we must not let them ever have even the slightest hope of victory. Not ever, Mr. Speaker.

DIPLOMATICALLY PURSUING STABILITY AND SECURITY IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well tonight after a long day of debate on whether or not we should redeploy our troops from Iraq.

A careful reading of the gentleman from Pennsylvania's resolution, had we debated it, would have pointed out that the fourth point that he raised was that we have to diplomatically pursue security and stability in Iraq. It is that issue I want to talk about because the question is always raised, If we leave,

will it not get worse? Will it not just explode into civil war? We have already got that. And the question must be answered as we talk about deployment from out of the country.

At the same time, we have to decide to call on the Arab League or the Egyptians, to call together all the members of the community of Iraq: the Sunnis, the Shias, the Kurds, the Turkomens, the Assyrians. All of them need to come together in a conference to resolve this. We have the idea that we can go with a Western idea of a constitution and that because it works here, we can just insert it into an Arab culture that has never worked under those circumstances.

□ 2350

What we need to do is recognize how Arabs have resolved problems for hundreds, thousands of years, if you will. It is called reaching an atwa.

If two villages, and this story was told to me by an iman, a high ranking Iraqi, he said many years ago two villages had a brother and sister and they married across these two towns. One went to one village, the other went to the other village. In one village the wife was fertile and quickly had three children. In the other, the wife was barren and had no children. The village made fun of her. They ridiculed her. They said she was a terrible woman, and the social pressure was so great that she killed herself by throwing herself into the village well.

Now under Arabic custom, that village that lost this woman has a right to go and extract blood within 24 hours. As those two villages came together for this bloodletting that was going to happen, they called and got them all to sit down and they decided how they were going to resolve this situation.

The decision was made that the village that had had the young woman die in it would give \$20,000 to the other village and that there would be no contact between those villages for 20 years. They reached an atwa, A-T-W-A.

What that is in the Arabic culture is an arrangement, not a peace treaty. In the West we think of peace treaties where I agree with you and you agree with me, and we sign a bunch of pieces of paper. In the Arab culture where there is honor, people say I will stay here for 20 years and you will stay there.

The gentleman who told me the story said I was there 20 years later when the money was brought back from the first village back to its original place. He said within 2 years, there were marriages between the young people from the two villages. Even though they were 6 kilometers apart, for 20 years there had been no contact.

Now, Arabs have been resolving these kinds of things for thousands of years in the desert. There is a way for the Sunnis and the Shias and the Kurds and the Turkomens to come together, but it cannot be driven by the United States. We cannot say you come over

here and come to this conference that we are going to have in some hotel somewhere. It has to be called by the Arab League.

This same thing could have prevented the gulf war back in 1991. When Saddam Hussein went into Kuwait, the Arab League said before the Americans attack, let us settle this among the Arab community. This is a fight among us. Saddam Hussein thought he had fought in Iran because he was defending Kuwait and the Saudis, and he thought that they owed him something. He said give me some money, and they said no. And so he said all right, then I am going to move in and take Kuwait.

It could have been resolved if we had the patience to let this happen and the mentality in the White House that can allow Iraq to develop its own peaceful society. We have removed Saddam Hussein. We are all glad, but we now must let the Arabs resolve the situation in a way that makes sense to them.

REMEMBERING ILLINOIS REPRESENTATIVE JOHN ERLENBORN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember a beloved former Congressman from Illinois who passed away October 30, Representative John Erlenborn. John was a member of this body for nearly 20 years. Throughout his distinguished service in Congress, he became an expert on labor and pension issues and helped shape our Nation during a formative time in our history.

Born and raised in suburban Chicago, Mr. Erlenborn enlisted in the U.S. Navy as a 17-year-old during World War II. He studied at the University of Notre Dame, Indiana University, the University of Illinois, and Loyola University in Chicago from which he later received his law degree.

John went on to practice law at a firm he founded before he began his life in public service as an assistant state's attorney for Illinois' DuPage County. This inspired John to run for elected office. He went on to serve for 8 years in the Illinois General Assembly before coming to Congress in 1965.

John earned a spot as the Republican ranking member of the House Education and Labor Committee where he became known as Mr. ERISA after avidly working to pass the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, which created corporate pension plan standards that continue to protect American workers today.

When John retired from Congress in 1985, he did not leave behind his compassion and motivation to help those less fortunate than himself. Instead of fully enjoying retirement, John continued to give back and was appointed to serve on the board of directors and selected to serve as president of the

Legal Services Corporation Board, committing himself to help those who needed legal services, but could not afford it. He also served as adjunct faculty member of the Georgetown University Law Center.

John represented what is now my congressional district, the 13th district of Illinois. He was committed to helping those in need and represented his constituents with honor and integrity.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the service John Erlenborn gave for the State of Illinois and our Nation for so many years.

On behalf of this body, I extend my deepest sympathies to the entire Erlenborn family during this difficult time. John Erlenborn lived a rich life. He never stopped giving to others even after his tenure in Congress, a model for all of us. He will be deeply missed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MEEK of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

STANDING TOGETHER FOR A SOLUTION TO BRING OUR TROOPS HOME

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized until midnight.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this was a day when many of us had wished that we could have taken a very serious step toward redeploying our troops and bringing them home. I believe it is very important to speak to the American people for this brief moment by telling them of a story of a young woman I saw in a hospital in Germany who had just been shipped from Iraq. She was burned from head to toe. She laid in a hospital bed; and, yes, as a soldier, she was valiant and courageous, and her only concern was for her mother.

I use that example because we have heard it on the floor tonight, how our soldiers want to go back into battle and how our soldiers want us to have the resolve to stay the course.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility as Members of Congress and policymakers whenever we send our soldiers into battle, we must send them for the right reasons.

We heard tonight that the American intelligence did not prove there were weapons of mass destruction, in fact, there were none; that the troops are in fact fodder for the insurgents, and health care is no longer promised to

our soldiers coming home; that we are now sending troops that are at the C-4 level, the lowest state of readiness; 50,000 may suffer from battle fatigue. It is important that we stand together for a solution to bring our troops home.

I voted "no" against the Hunter resolution because it was not a serious debate. It was not a serious statement to our soldiers, and I want them to know that I am willing to stay the course, but I want them to come home, and I want them to come home now with a plan. And a plan has been offered by Mr. MURTHA in H.J. Res. 73, a plan that suggests that the troops should be in a small number in the region, but our troops in large numbers should come home from Iraq. We must turn the government of Iraq over to Iraq.

This is the debate we should have:

H.J. RES. _____

To Redeploy U.S. Forces from Iraq.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NOVEMBER 17, 2005

Mr. Murtha introduced the following joint resolution, which was referred to the Committee on _____

Whereas Congress and the American People have not been shown clear, measurable progress toward establishment of stable and improving security in Iraq or of a stable and improving economy in Iraq, both of which are essential to "promote the emergence of a democratic government";

Whereas additional stabilization in Iraq by U.S. military forces cannot be achieved without the deployment of hundreds of thousands of additional U.S. troops, which in turn cannot be achieved without a military draft;

Whereas more than \$277 billion has been appropriated by the United States Congress to prosecute U.S. military action in Iraq and Afghanistan;

Whereas, as of the drafting of this resolution, 2,079 U.S. troops have been killed in Operation Iraqi Freedom;

Whereas U.S. forces have become the target of the insurgency;

Whereas, according to recent polls, over 80 percent of the Iraqi people want the U.S. forces out of Iraq;

Whereas polls also indicate that 45 percent of the Iraqi people feel that the attacks on U.S. forces are justified;

Whereas, due to the foregoing, Congress finds it evident that continuing U.S. military action in Iraq is not in the best interests of the United States of America, the people of Iraq, or the Persian Gulf Region, which were cited in Public Law 107-243 as justification for undertaking such action;

Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

That:

SECTION 1. The deployment of United States forces in Iraq, by direction of Congress, is hereby terminated and the forces involved are to be redeployed at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 2. A quick-reaction U.S. force and an over-the-horizon presence of U.S. Marines shall be deployed in the region.

SEC. 3. The United States of America shall pursue security and stability in Iraq through diplomacy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MCKINNEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ABLE DANGER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I include material regarding Able Danger for the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, November 9, 2005.

Hon. DONALD RUMSFELD,
Secretary, Department of Defense, The Pentagon, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY RUMSFELD: We the undersigned are formally requesting that you allow former participants in the intelligence program known as Able Danger to testify in an open hearing before the United States Congress. Until this point, congressional efforts to investigate Able Danger have been obstructed by Department of Defense insistence that certain individuals with knowledge of Able Danger be prevented from freely and frankly testifying in an open hearing. We realize that you do not question Congress's authority to maintain effective oversight of executive branch agencies, including your department. It is our understanding that your objection instead derives from concern that classified information could be improperly exposed in an open hearing. We of course would never support any activity that might compromise sensitive information involving national security. However, we firmly believe that testimony from the appropriate individuals in an open hearing on Able Danger would not only fail to jeopardize national security, but would in fact enhance it over the long term. This is due to our abiding belief that America can only better prepare itself against future attacks if it understands the full scope of its past failures to do so.

On September 21, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary conducted a hearing on Able Danger which Bill Dugan, Acting Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Intelligence Oversight, certified did not reveal any classified information. Congressman Curt Weldon's testimony at that hearing was largely based on the information that has been given to him by Able Danger participants barred from open testimony by DOD. Their testimony would therefore closely mirror that of Congressman Weldon, who did not reveal classified information. Therefore we are at a loss as to how the testimony of Able Danger participants would jeopardize classified information. Much of what they would present has already been revealed. Further refusal to allow Able Danger participants to testify in an open congressional hearing can only lead us to conclude that the Department of Defense is uncomfortable with the prospect of Members of Congress questioning these individuals about the circumstances surrounding Able Danger. This would suggest not a concern for national security, but rather an attempt to prevent potentially embarrassing facts from coming to light. Such a consideration would of course be an unacceptable justification for the refusal of a congressional request.

Sincerely,

CURT WELDON,
JOHN P. MURTHA.